

Required Action Districts: School Improvement Grants Guidelines and Requirements

Tonya Middling, Director, DSIA

Bill Mason, Director, DSIA

Janell Newman, *MERIT* Coordinator, DSIA

Candace Gratama, The BERC Group

Greg Lobdell, Center for Educational Effectiveness (CEE)

Office of Superintendent of Public Instruction
District and School Improvement and Accountability
December 13, 2010



School Improvement Grants

- **Purpose:** Turn around lowest 5% of schools nationwide
- **Allocation** for FY 2010
 - Approximately \$7.5 million available for the 11-12 school year for district's selected for cohort II.
 - Covers districts designated for required action as well

Which Schools Are Eligible to Receive SIG Funds?

Persistently Lowest-Achieving Schools:

Tier I Schools

Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that-

- Is among the lowest-achieving five percent of Title I schools in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring in the State or the five lowest-achieving such schools (whichever number of schools is greater); or
- Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is below 60 percent over a number of years.

Tier II Schools

Any secondary school that is eligible for, but does not receive, Title I, Part A funds that-

- Is among the lowest achieving five percent of secondary schools or the five lowest-achieving secondary schools in the State that are eligible for, but do not receive, Title I funds; or
- Is a high school that has had a graduation rate as defined in 34 C.F.R. § 200.19(b) that is below 60 percent over a number of years;

Tier III Schools

- Any Title I school in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring that is not a Tier I school.

Four SIG School Intervention Models

Turnaround

Restart

Closure

Transformation

Turnaround Model Overview

SIG funded Districts that implement Turnaround start the school improvement timeline over effective 2011-12.

Teachers and Leaders

- Replace principal
- Use locally adopted “turnaround” competencies to review and select staff for school (rehire no more than 50% of existing staff)
- Implement strategies to recruit, place, and retain staff

Instructional and Support Strategies

- Select and implement an instructional model based on student needs
- Provide job-embedded Professional Development designed to build capacity and support staff
- Ensure continuous use of data to inform and differentiate instruction

Time and Support

- Provide *increased learning time*
- Staff and students
- Social-emotional and community-oriented services and supports

Governance

- New governance structure
- Grant operating flexibility to school leader

May also implement any of the required or permissible strategies under the Transformation Model

Restart Model Overview

- Restart model is one in which an LEA converts a school or closes and reopens a school under a charter school operator, a charter management organization (CMO), or an education management organization (EMO) that has been selected **through a rigorous review process**.
 - A restart model must enroll, within the grades it serves, any former student who wishes to attend the school.
 - A rigorous review process could take such things into consideration as an applicant's team, track record, instructional program, model's theory of action, sustainability.
 - As part of this model, a State must review the process the LEA will use/has used to select the partner.

School Closure Model Overview

- School closure occurs when an LEA closes a school and enrolls the students who attended that school in other schools in the LEA that are **higher-achieving**.
 - These schools should be within reasonable proximity to the closed school and may include, but are not limited to, charter schools or new schools for which achievement data are not yet available.

Transformation Model Overview

Teachers and Leaders

- Replace **principal**
- Implement new evaluation system
 - Developed with staff
 - Uses student growth as a significant factor
- Identify and reward staff who are increasing student outcomes; support and then remove those who are not
- Implement strategies to recruit, place and retain staff

Instructional and Support Strategies

- Select and implement an instructional model based on student needs
- Provide job-embedded Professional Development designed to build capacity and support staff
- Ensure continuous use of data to inform and differentiate instruction

Time and Support

- Provide *increased learning time*
 - Staff and students
- Provide ongoing mechanisms for community and family engagement
- Partner to provide social-emotional and community-oriented services and support

Governance

- Provide sufficient operating flexibility to implement reform
- Ensure ongoing technical assistance

An LEA with nine or more Tier I and Tier II schools may not implement the Transformation Model in more than 50% of those schools.

Overview of FY 2010 SIG

- There are no major policy changes for the FY 2010 SIG competition.
- There are a few changes to the FY 2010 non-regulatory guidance addressing:
 - Flexibility to generate new lists
 - Pre-implementation
 - Parent and community engagement
- Modifications and new questions are noted in the non-regulatory guidance.

Pre-Implementation

- LEAs may use FY 2010 SIG funds prior to the 2011-2012 school year (pre-implementation period).
 - Examples of how funds may be used include, but are not limited to:
 - Holding parent and community meetings to review school performance, and discuss the new model to be implemented;
 - Recruiting and hiring the incoming principal, leadership team, and instructional staff;
 - Conducting a rigorous review process to select and contract with an EMO if selecting an education management organization (EMO) not included on the State vetted Comprehensive Educational Service Provider list; and
 - Providing professional development that will enable staff to fully and effectively implement one of the four federal intervention models.

Parent and Community Engagement

- There is an increased emphasis in the November 1, 2010 guidance on consulting with families and community members during the selection, planning, and implementation of a school intervention model (e.g., community meetings, family and community surveys, parent and student focused interviews, sharing of information regarding social services, parent outreach coordinators, hotlines, etc.)

Quantifying Low-Achieving

- Following Guidance- Added Ranks Method for 6 ranks
 - Results in a value for each school between 1 and $6 \times N$
- FINAL ordering:
 - Schools in lowest-5% in BOTH reading and math
 - Total “added ranks”
 - Lack of progress relative to state

Definitions

- ***Persistently lowest-achieving:*** Schools with three consecutive years of data in the lowest 5% in both reading and mathematics and secondary schools with a weighted average of graduation rates less than 60% over a three-year period.
 - Title I or Title I eligible
 - Weighting is equal between reading and mathematics
 - Weighting is equal between elementary and secondary schools
 - Graduation rate weighted-average is based on the number of students for each year.
 - Graduation rate is calculated as required in Guidance on School Improvement Grants, January 21, 2010 consistent with C.F.R. § 200.19(b)
- ***Lack of Progress:*** The school's percent increase or decrease (slope of linear regression) over the most recent three-year period compared to the state slope.
- ***Title I eligible:*** Based on SY 2009-10 student data, a school is considered Title I eligible if:
 - Poverty percentage is 35% or more; or
 - The school's poverty percentage is greater than or equal to the district's poverty average.

Sizing The Tiers

There are 2084 schools in Washington State for which Adequate Yearly Progress is calculated

Tier I	Tier II
Step 2: Of the 2084 schools, there are a total of 928 Title I schools (removed 1156 schools who are not Title I).	Step 2: Of the 2084 schools, 1029 serve one or more students in grades 7 through 10 (removed 1055 schools who serve no students in grade 7 through High School)
Step 3: Of the 928 Title I schools, 516 schools are in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring (removed 412 schools who are not in improvement, corrective action, or restructuring)	Step 3: Of the 1029 schools, 630 are Title I eligible (removed 399 schools not eligible for Title I)
Step 4: Given this data set, 5% of 516 is 26 schools ($516 \times .05 = 25.8$)	Step 4: Of the 630, 400 of these schools do not receive Title I funds (removed 230 who receive Title I)
	Step 5: Given this data set, 5% of 400 is 20 schools ($400 \times .05 = 20.0$)
Note: Of the 516, 497 are stack ranked (19 do not have 3 years of data in both Reading and Math)	Note: Of the 400, 299 are stack ranked (101 do not have 3 years of data in both Reading and Math)

Example

Tier 1: 516 schools in consideration set (ranks 1 to 497)

School	2008 Reading	2009 Reading	2010 Reading	2008 Math	2009 Math	2010 Math	Added Ranks	Progress vs. State
1	430	480	455	433	470	465	2733	No: -1.8
2	433	465	463	486	476	410	2733	No: -2.9
3	493	479	475	471	461	440	2819	No: -3.1
4	490	487	488	459	455	473	2852	No:-2.7

- School 4: in bottom 5% in both reading and math
- School 3: Larger 'added rank' than 1 & 2
- Schools 1 & 2: Tie in added ranks so next step is "progress"

E2SSB 6696 / RCW 28A.675

Required Action Districts (RADs)

- District did not volunteer in 2010 or the school is new to the PLA list, and
- School did not make progress in reading and math in the “all students” category and improvement rate is less than the state average based on combined proficiency in the past 3 years
- Note: Cannot designate a district with an existing SIG

Ranking

Schools are ranked in priority order based on:

- The lowest levels of achievement in the all students group in reading and mathematics combined for the past three consecutive years; and
- The schools with the lowest rate of improvement in reading and mathematics combined for the past three years.

State Prioritization for District Selection

Greatest Need and Strongest Commitment are cornerstones to federal guidance of final selection for SIG participation

OSPI will prioritize district applications based on criteria listed below:

- ***Districts that have been designated for required action***
- Districts with Tier I or Tier II schools on the PLA list for two consecutive years

Additional consideration for final selection may include:

- Geographic distribution of Tier I and Tier II schools throughout the State
- Number of schools within each tier
- Size of schools within each tier

An SEA's SIG Grant award to an LEA *must*:

- Include not less than \$50,000 or more than \$2,000,000 per year for each participating school.

Competitive SIG Applicant Pool

Cohort II Tier I and II Schools eligible for a SIG:

- 50 schools located in 37 districts are identified on the PLA list
- **4 of these schools will be recommended to the State Board of Education for Required Action designation.**
- 21 schools have been identified on the PLA list for two consecutive years.

It is estimated that 3-5 schools will be selected through the competitive application process for SIG Cohort II funding

- Based on the eligible districts invited to apply, we project a 10 to 20% chance of any school being selected.
- We encourage local school boards and superintendents to give serious consideration to the limitations in funding and the competitive applicant pool when making application decisions.

School/District Academic Performance Audit

■ **Process and timeline**

- January and February 2011
- Team of 2 to 8 BEREC representatives will visit the school for one or two days
- Focus on School and Classroom Practices
- Information gathered through:
 - Interviews and focus groups with administrators, certificated and non-certificated staff members, students, and parents
 - Classroom Observation Study, using the STAR Classroom Observation Protocol
 - Analysis of other data in information, including school and district improvement plans, survey results, and other school/district documents

School/District Academic Performance Audit

- **Additional Data Collection**
 - Completion of staff, student, and parent surveys
 - High Schools Only
 - Master Schedules: 2007 – 2008, 2008 – 2009, 2009 – 2010 school years
 - Transcripts: 2008, 2009, and 2010 graduates

School/District Academic Performance Audit

- **Components and reports**
 - This is not a comprehensive school review.
 - Results in an overview of the relationship of the school in comparison to a rubric aligned with the *Nine Characteristics of High Performing Schools*.
 - Helps to assist in the selection of a School Intervention Model.
 - Provides recommendations that will assist school personnel in completing the application.
 - Identifies areas the school/district may need a more comprehensive review.

The Required Action Plan

Districts develop a Required Action plan that

- Addresses audit results
- Is developed and implemented with collaboration with school and community
- Utilizes one of four federal intervention models

E2SSB 6696 / RCW 28A.675

Required Action Districts (RADs)

- Required Action Districts will be designated by the State Board of Education and will not compete for the federal funds, but they must follow the requirements for the Federal School Improvement Grants and SB 6696.
- Required Action Districts must allow for the opening of any collective bargaining approved after June 10, 2010 if necessary to meet requirements of the federal intervention models and findings from the academic performance audit.

Impasse Options

In the case of impasse, agreement will be reached either through

- Mediation, or
- Superior Court.

If no plan is submitted or the plan is not approved:

SBE shall direct the Superintendent of Public Instruction to require the local school district to redirect its Title I funds based on the academic performance audit findings.

Exit Criteria

- A school district may be recommended for removal from required action after three years of implementation if the district has no school or schools on the list of persistently lowest achieving schools, **and**
- The school or schools on the list of persistently lowest achieving schools have a positive improvement trend in reading and mathematics on the state's assessment in the “all students” category based on a three-year average.

Timeline

December
2010 -
January
2011

- Dec. 1, 2010
LEA's notified of OSPI's RAD recommendation
- Dec. 15th
Reconsideration request due
- Dec. 3, 2010
SEA's SIG applications due to ED
- ED awards SIG grants to States

January -
March
2011

- Jan 12, SBE designates RADs
- OSPI conducts School and District Level Academic Performance Audits
- LEA reopens CBA, in areas needed
- LEA application/Required Action Plan (RAP) development and submission due March 4
- RAP approved by SBE

April - July
2011

- SEA awards grants to LEAs
- LEAs begin pre-implementation including recruiting, selection and placement of school administrators and instructional staff

August -
October
2011

- *MERIT* districts and schools create and implement first 90 day plan

Final List Publication

It is anticipated the final list will become public on or before February 1, 2011, and when the following conditions have been met:

- The final list has been validated;
- The Washington application has been approved by the US Department of Education; and
- School districts have been officially notified of school status

Coming Up...

- LEA Application available through iGrants: January 19, 2011
- OSPI Webinar on LEA Application Requirements: January 20, 2011
- External district and school level academic performance audits begin: January 24 through February 18th, 2011
- OSPI announces awardees of competitive SIGs: March 31, 2011 (for RADs, subject to SBE's approval of RAPs)

Additional Information

Final Guidance published in the Federal Register, dated November 1, 2010

- <http://www2.ed.gov/programs/sif/index.html>
- OSPI SIG Website:
<http://www.k12.wa.us/Improvement/SIG/default.aspx>
 - Your frequently asked questions (FAQs)
- Send questions to SIG@k12.wa.us.

Thank you!